

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
WESTERN DIVISION**

---

RICKEY BENSON,	)	
	)	
Petitioner,	)	
	)	
v.	)	No. 2:23-cv-02584-SHL-atc
	)	
FLOYD BONNER, JR.,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	

---

**ORDER DENYING PETITIONER'S SECOND MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

---

Petitioner Rickey Benson seeks reconsideration of the Court's January 29, 2025 order denying his first motion for reconsideration. (ECF No. 28.) In that order, the Court affirmed its denial of his motion to consolidate his two appellate cases because his original motion was not properly before this Court. (ECF No. 27 at PageID 65.) The Court also affirmed its denial of his post-judgment motion to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal because it had already denied him a certificate of appealability, and Benson had not suggested any new reason to rule differently. (Id.) Benson seeks successive reconsideration under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b), but that rule does not authorize reconsideration of an order on a motion for reconsideration. See *Morgan v. AMISUB (SFH), Inc.*, No. 2:18-cv-02042-TLP-tmp, 2021 WL 1947871, \*1 (W.D. Tenn. May 14, 2021). The rules do not contemplate an endless loop of reconsidering the same issue.

Even if the Court could reconsider its order, Benson's second motion for reconsideration is no more persuasive than his first—he simply reiterates the same argument that the Court has already twice considered and rejected. Thus, his motion is **DENIED**. Benson is cautioned

against filing a third motion. “Repeated motions for reconsideration are not acceptable merely because a party disagrees with the Court’s decision.” Pharmacy Records v. Nassar, Case Number 05-72126, 2008 WL 11355569, at \*5 (E.D. Mich. Dec. 4, 2008) (quoting Powers v. NWA, Inc., No. 05-2468-B/P, 2006 WL 984738, at \*2 (W.D. Tenn. Apr. 13, 2006)).

**IT IS SO ORDERED**, this 17th day of April, 2025.

s/ Sheryl H. Lipman \_\_\_\_\_  
SHERYL H. LIPMAN  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE